
REMARKS

This amendment is supplemental to the amendment filed July 13, 2006. Claims 1-33, 37-46 and 48-52 are pending. Claims 1, 15, 26, 31, 37 and 48-52, the independent claims, have been amended. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants would like to bring to the Examiner's attention the fact that a Continuation In Part (CIP) of the present application was filed on June 29, 2001 and was assigned Application No. 09/897,594. The CIP is currently before Examiner Clement B. Graham in Art Unit 3628. A non-final Office Action is currently outstanding in that case.

All of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Togher et al. in view of Breen et al. In the Amendment filed July 13, 2006, Applicants submitted arguments and amendments distinguishing independent claims 1, 15, 26, 31, 37 and 48-52 over the cited references.

Applicants thank Examiner Karmis for the cordial telephone interview in this case conducted with Applicants' undersigned representative on August 8, 2006. During the interview, the Breen reference was discussed in detail, specifically the portions of Breen discussed in the July 13, 2006 Amendment. Applicants' representative pointed out why the cited portions of Breen do not correspond to the recited joint execution orders. The arguments made were based on those made in the July 13, 2006 Amendment.

The Examiner indicated during the interview that he had been persuaded that the feature of the joint execution order as recited in the independent claims is patentable over the combination of Togher et al. and Breen et al. However, the

Examiner requested that the language "operable to allow" in each independent claim be modified somewhat, without changing the scope of those claims.


In response to the Examiner's suggestion, each independent claim has been amended to recite that at least one of the order input devices is a device "for a trader entering a joint execution order" Note that this language is intended to mean exactly the same thing as the previous language. That is, this limitation means that at least one of the input devices can accept entry of a joint execution order. The amendments do not narrow the claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, and the results of the telephone interview, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Dated: August 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By


Joseph W. Ragusa

Registration No.: 38,586

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicants